

RALPH N. KLEPS AWARDS  
For Improvement in the Administration of the Courts  
Nominations 2004-2005

---

ELIGIBILITY

---

- A. To be eligible for an award, a project must meet all of the following criteria:
- ◆ It is a project of a California court.
  - ◆ It reflects the intent of at least one of the six goals of the Judicial Council's strategic plan.
  - ◆ It is innovative. "Innovative" is defined as *creating value by initiating practices that enhance judicial efficiency and effectiveness*.
  - ◆ It has results, outcomes, or benefits that have demonstrated its impact on the court and the public it serves.
  - ◆ It is replicable in other courts.

- B. Each court fits into one of five award categories. Superior court categories are based on the number of authorized judicial positions (AJPs) it has:

- |                                    |  |
|------------------------------------|--|
| 1. Superior courts with 2-10 AJPs  | 4. Appellate courts                    |
| 2. Superior courts with 11-39 AJPs | 5. Collaborative projects (two or more |
| 3. Superior courts with 40+ AJPs   | courts working together on a project.) |

As many as 11 total awards may be given, encompassing all categories.

- C. Each superior or appellate court may submit up to *two* nominations (the Superior Court of Los Angeles County may nominate up to four projects). Projects that do not receive an award the first time may be renominated once. Courts may be included in up to *two* collaborative project nominations in addition to their two nominations.

---

NOMINATION PROCEDURES

---

- A. Each question on the nomination form must be answered completely and within the total number of words indicated. Incomplete answers and answers exceeding the word limits will not be considered.
- B. Please designate a single contact person from the court who will be responsible for securing additional information and coordinating the site visit.
- C. Members of the Kleps Awards Committee will review nominations and visit the sites of nominated projects that fully meet the eligibility criteria, based on the written narratives. The Judicial Council will make the final determination of award recipients at its June 2005 meeting.
- D. Nominations must be e-mailed to [beth.shirk@jud.ca.gov](mailto:beth.shirk@jud.ca.gov) (Administrative Office of the Courts) no later than **5 p.m. on Friday, October 1, 2004**. Faxed, mailed, or incomplete nomination forms will not be considered. The nomination form can be obtained from [www.courtinfo.ca.gov/programs/kleps.htm](http://www.courtinfo.ca.gov/programs/kleps.htm). If the project includes a product (videotape, manual, etc.), do not submit it with the nomination form. All collateral material will be requested after the eligibility screening and before the site visit.

*Direct any questions to Beth Shirk at 415-865-7870 or [beth.shirk@jud.ca.gov](mailto:beth.shirk@jud.ca.gov).*

## Judicial Council of California Strategic Plan Goals

*Goal I: ACCESS, FAIRNESS, AND DIVERSITY.* All Californians will have equal access to the courts and equal ability to participate in court proceedings, and will be treated in a fair and just manner. Members of the judicial branch community will reflect the rich diversity of the state's residents.

*Goal II: INDEPENDENCE AND ACCOUNTABILITY.* The judiciary will be an institutionally independent, co-equal branch of government that responsibly seeks, uses, and accounts for public resources necessary for its support. The independence of judicial decision-making will be protected.

*Goal III: MODERNIZATION OF MANAGEMENT AND ADMINISTRATION.* Justice will be administered in a timely, efficient, and effective manner that utilizes contemporary management practices; innovative ideas; highly competent judges, other judicial officers, and staff; and adequate facilities.

*Goal IV: QUALITY OF JUSTICE AND SERVICE TO THE PUBLIC.* Judicial branch services will be responsive to the needs of the public and will enhance the public's understanding and use of and its confidence in the judiciary.

*Goal V: EDUCATION.* The effectiveness of judges, court personnel, and other judicial branch staff will be enhanced through high-quality continuing education and professional development.

*Goal VI: TECHNOLOGY.* Technology will enhance the quality of justice by improving the ability of the judicial branch to collect, process, analyze, and share information and by increasing the public's access to information about the judicial branch.

Please refer to [www.courtinfo.ca.gov/reference/documents/stplan2k.pdf](http://www.courtinfo.ca.gov/reference/documents/stplan2k.pdf).

### Categories for Kleps Awards

Category 1 (2–10 AJP's)		Category 2 (11–39 AJP's)		Category 3 (40+ AJP's)	Category 4 (Appellate Courts)	Category 5 (Collaborative Projects)
Alpine	Mendocino	Butte	Santa Barbara	Alameda	All appellate Courts and Supreme Court	Two or more courts working together on a project.
Amador	Modoc	Imperial	Shasta	Contra Costa		
Calaveras	Mono	Marin	Solano	Fresno		
Colusa	Napa	Merced	Sonoma	Kern		
Del Norte	Nevada	Monterey	Stanislaus	Los Angeles		
El Dorado	Plumas	Placer	Tulare	Orange		
Glenn	San Benito	San Joaquin	Ventura	Riverside		
Humboldt	Sierra	Sal Luis Obispo	Yolo	Sacramento		
Inyo	Siskiyou	San Mateo		San Bernardino		
Kings	Sutter	Santa Cruz		San Diego		
Lake	Tehama			San Francisco		
Lassen	Trinity			Santa Clara		
Madera	Tuolumne					
Mariposa	Yuba					

**RALPH N. KLEPS AWARDS**  
For Improvement in the Administration of the Courts  
**2004-2005 Nomination Form**

Due by Friday, October 1, 2004, 5:00 p.m.

*E-mail this form to [beth.shirk@jud.ca.gov](mailto:beth.shirk@jud.ca.gov). For questions, call Beth Shirk at 415-865-7870.*

**Court:**

**Nomination category  
(1, 2, 3, 4, or 5):**

**Title of project:**

**Category 5 only, list the lead court and all collaborating court partners:**

**Project location/address:**

**Project contact (name and title):**

**Contact phone number (with area code):**

**Contact e-mail address:**

**Has this project been nominated for a Kleps Award before? \_\_\_\_\_ If so, when? \_\_\_\_\_**

**Project summary (maximum of 150 words):**

1. Project description (maximum 700 words)
  - a. What problem or need was this project initiated to address, and when?
  - b. What are the project's goals or desired outcomes?
  - c. Describe the program. Include staffing, project activities, amount and sources of funding or other resources needed to develop and operate the project.
  - d. Are similar projects operating in other courts? How have you determined this?
  - e. If similar projects are operating in other courts, where are they, and how is your project different?
2. Project evaluation and impact (maximum 400 words)
  - a. How do you know the project is successful and who are the major beneficiaries?
  - b. How are you measuring the impact of the project?
  - c. What are the project's evaluation results, outcomes, or benefits?
3. Award eligibility requirements (maximum of 400 words)
  - a. How is the nominating court involved with the project?
  - b. Which goal(s) of the strategic plan of the Judicial Council of California are supported by this project?
  - c. Why is this project innovative?
  - d. How would you recommend other courts replicate this project? What obstacles might others encounter?
4. For **Category 5** projects only (maximum 200 words)
  - a. How were the collaborative court partners involved with the planning and implementation of the project?
  - b. Describe the specific contributions of the collaborative court partners.